Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: __10/084,856__   First Named Applicant: __Douglas U. Mennie__

Examiner: __Jamie Swartz__   Art __3684__   Status of Application: __Non-Final__

Tentative Participants:

(1) __William Pegg__   (2) __Examiner Swartz__

(3) __Vince Wiltse (Cummins Allison)__   (4) __John Blake (Cummins Allison)__

(5) __Curtis Hallowell (Cummins Allison)__

Proposed Date of Interview: __February 1, 2 or 3__   **Proposed Time:** __Open__   Eastern Time

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☐ Telephonic   (2) ☒ Personal   (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES   ☒ NO

Issues To Be Discussed

	Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1)	103(a) Rejection	271, 275-280	Molbak et al. US 5,620,079 Small US 5,513,117 Geib et al. US 6,042,470	☐	☐	☐
(2)	103(a) Rejection	272	Molbak et al. US 5,620,079 Small US 5,513,117 Geib et al. US 6,042,470 Avnet et al. US 5,291,003	☐	☐	☐
(3)	103(a) Rejection	273	Molbak et al. US 5,620,079 Small US 5,513,117 Geib et al. US 6,042,470 Mays et al. US 5547062 Ramsey et al. US 5842188	☐	☐	☐
(4)	103(a) Rejection	274	Molbak et al. US 5,620,079 Small US 5,513,117 Geib et al. US 6,042,470 Avnet et al. US 5,291,003 Mays et al. US 5547062 Ramsey et al. US 5842188	☐	☐	☐

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Claims 271, 275-280 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molbak et al. (US 5620079 A) in view of Small (US 5513117 A) in further view of Geib et al. (US 6042470 A). Molbak is alleged to teach "storing to a card a monetary value that is related to a total value (col. 6, lines 6-20, col. 2, lines 30-60)" and "dispensing said card from the self-service machine (col. 4, line 59 – col. 5, line 2)." These assertions are incorrect, as Molbak fails to disclose these features. Instead, the cited passages of Molbak, and the balance of Molbak, disclose a "voucher" dispensing machine that comprises a paper voucher on which is printed certain information (see, e.g., col. 10, line 64 to col. 11, line 2, disclosing that the voucher printer preferably comprises "a thermal printing system, laser printing system, inkjet system, or the like"). Accordingly, Molbak fails to disclose, *inter alia*, "selecting a card from a plurality of cards that are not associated with any value, storing on a storage medium of said card a monetary value that is related to said total value, and dispensing said card from the self-service machine.

Small is alleged to disclose "selecting a card from a plurality of cards that are not associated with any value" (citing col. 6, lines 6-20, col. 2, lines 30-60). However, Small relates to a "automated vending apparatus for simultaneously dispensing personalized greeting cards and electronically vendable gifts" (col. 2, lines 30-31). However, the ability to select a card from a plurality of cards relates merely to selections from a card for a birthday, a wedding, Christmas, etc. (see FIG. 5). The only card having a storage medium to which a value could be stored is a telephone calling card (see FIG. 10). However, FIG. 9 shows that the telephone gift card is to provided to a customer <u>over the counter</u> after the clerk has authorized printing of the greeting card (see also col. 10, lines 12-20). Even were Geib to be accepted to disclose that which is alleged by the Examiner, the combination fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the claims and the Examiner has not set forth a prima facie case supporting the obviousness of such combination.

Claim 272 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molbak et al. (US 5620079 A) in view of Small (US 5513117 A), Geib et al. (US 6042470 A), and Avnet et al. (US 5291003 A). The Examiner generally cites, in essence, the entirety of Avnet (**citing col. 1, line 60 to col. 5, line 40**) for disclosing "receiving a credit card in a card module of the self-service machine; accessing, using a communication device, an account associated with the credit card; deducting a specified amount from a line of credit associated with said credit card; and adding to said total value of the bulk coins the specified amount prior to the act of dispensing the card having the storage medium for storing the monetary value that is related to said total value". The Examiner's allegations aside, Avnet fails to make up for the deficiencies of the combination of Molbak, Small, and Geib and fails to disclose or suggest "selecting a card from a plurality of cards that are not associated with any value; storing on a storage medium of said card a monetary value that is related to said total value; and dispensing said card from the self-service machine." Instead, Avent relates to businesses and institutions that "provide food to their employees and guests" that may be purchased from their own vending machines (col. 1, lines 23-30)(not cited by Examiner). Avent discloses only the vending of a single, specific-use card for use with a particular vending machine or group of vending machines.

Claim 273 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molbak et al. (US 5620079 A) in view of Small (US 5513117 A), Geib et al. (US 6042470 A), Mays et al. (US 5547062 A), and Ramsey et al. (US 5842188 A). Neither Mays nor Ramsey make up for the deficiencies of the combination of Molbak, Small, and Geib and the Examiner has not set forth a prima facie case supporting the obviousness of such combination. Further, it is noted that the Examiner's reliance on the Applicant's own disclosure in supporting the assertion that one of "ordinary skill in the art," as opposed to the instant inventors, would have reasonably looked to Ramsey (see page 10 of Office Action).

Claim 274 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molbak et al. (US 5620079 A) in view of Small (US 5513117 A), Geib et al. (US 6042470 A), Mays et al. (US 5547062 A), Ramsey et al. (US 5842188 A), and Avent. At least for the reasons noted above, the combination fails to reasonably disclose or suggest all of the claim elements and the Examiner has not set forth a prima facie case supporting the obviousness of such combination.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____ .

/William D. PEGG, Reg. # 42,988/
_____ _____
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature   Examiner/SPE Signature

William D. Pegg
_____
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative
42988
_____
Registration Number, if applicable